<center>**Remarks**</center>

The above Amendments, these Remarks, and a Request for Continued Examination are in reply to the Office Action mailed September 14, 2007.

I.   Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Claims 1 and 6-31 were pending in the Application prior to the Office Action mailed September 14, 2007. The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 6-31.

Claim 1 and 6-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1, 6-8, 11, 12, 14-21, and 25-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrams et al. (US 6,836,883) in view of Chan et al. (US 2003/0028364).

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrams et al. (US 6,836,883) in view of Chan et al. (US 2003/0028364) further in view of Bau et al. (US 2003/0023957).

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrams et al. (US 6,836,883) in view of Chan et al. (US 2003/0028364) further in view of Vaidyanathan et al. (US 6,367,068).

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrams et al. (US 6,836,883) in view of Chan et al. (US 2003/0028364) further in view of Patel (US 2004/0103406).

Claims 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrams et al. (US 6,836,883) in view of Chan et al. (US 2003/0028364) further in view of Skinner et al. (US 6,721,740).

Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrams et al. (US 6,836,883) in view of Chan et al. (US 2003/0028364) further in view of Iwashita (US 7,073,167).

<center>- 7 -</center>

II.   Summary of Applicants' Response

This Request for Continued Examination cancels claims 13, 27, and 31, and amends claims 1, 9, and 22, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1, 6-12, 14-26, and 28-31. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

III.   Response to Rejections

Independent Claim 1 was amended to include features from dependent claims 13, 22, and 31.

35 U.S.C. 101 rejection to Independent Claim 1

Independent Claim 1 was amended to provide that the one or more compilers are executed by one or more processors to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection to Independent Claim 1

Independent Claim 1 (as amended) states:

A system, comprising:

one or more compilers, _executed by one or more processors,_ wherein the compilers support mixing and nesting of languages within a source file;

an extensible multi-language compiler framework, wherein the compiler framework provides a language-independent source code editor with information about the source file, comprising: 2ignatures of classes defined by the source file, errors found in the source file, stack of nested languages at any point in the source file, and information exposed by any languages; and

the language-independent source code editor, wherein the language-independent source code editor communicates to the compiler framework using language-independent metadata:

- 8 -

wherein the extensible multi-language compiler framework has error correction in code-generation, permitting a user to run code even if there is an error in the code;

wherein a thread pool allows compilation of multiple files to be performed in parallel;

wherein a type cache contains signatures for classes.

The Office Action conceded that Abrams does not disclose a language-independent source code editor. However, the Office Action asserted that Chan taught a language-independent source code editor.

The Office Action conceded that Abrams does not disclose a compiler framework that has error correction in code-generation, permitting a user to run code even if there is an error in the code. However, the Office Action asserted that Patel paragraphs 6, 27-28, and 32 teach that the compiler framework has error correction in code generation, permitting users to run the code even if there is an error in the code. Patel describes a system where errors that are caused by incorrect file paths are corrected with the correct file paths.

The Office Action conceded that Chan does not disclose maintaining a type cache containing signatures of classes. However, the Office Action asserted that Skinner teaches a type cache containing signatures of classes, citing FIG. 3 and associated text. Yet Skinner's FIG. 3 describes a client side object cache storing data objects. Skinner does not disclose maintaining a type cache containing signatures of classes.

The Office Action conceded that Abrams does not disclose a thread pool that allows compilation of multiple files to be performed in parallel. However, the Office Action asserted that Iwashita teaches parallel compilation of multiple files, citing col. 15, Fig. 22, Fig. 24, and associated text. While Iwashita describes compilation of multiple files, there is no discussion of a thread pool. Iwashita does not disclose a thread pool that allows compilation of multiple files to be performed in

- 9 -

parallel.

Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment as defined in Independent Claim 1 is not obvious in view of the combination of Abrams, Chan, Patel, Skinner, and Iwashita. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection to claim 1 be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections to Dependent Claims 6-12, 14-26, and 28-31

Dependent Claims 6-12, 14-26, and 28-31 depend from Claim 1. For at least the reasons discussed above with regards to Claim 1, dependent Claims 6-12, 14-26, and 28-31 are also patentable. Dependent Claims 6-12, 14-26, and 28-31 add their own features, which render them patentable in their own right.

IV.   Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 13, 2007   By: /Thomas K. Plunkett/
                                                      Thomas K. Plunkett
FLIESLER MEYER LLP   Reg. No. 57,253
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800

- 10 -